

could disapprove as a House. We could perhaps do a concurrent resolution or joint resolution—doubtful that HARRY REID would allow it to the come to the floor of the Senate, and doubtful that it would pass. But in any case, the House can act on its own with a resolution of disapproval.

That may not be strong enough to cause the President to come to his constitutional senses, so the next step would be, in my judgment then, a resolution of censure for the President.

Now, again, I will reserve the language in that and not define it more precisely until we get an opportunity to actually see what it is that he does, but nobody in this country can paint the picture on how the President can expand amnesty and still be restrained by the Constitution because of the statutes that exist and the restraints that he has that are built into the separation of powers.

So a resolution of disapproval, number one; a resolution of censure, number two; and if, perhaps, that resolution of censure will bring the President to his senses and the President could look at the outrage of the American people, which I believe will boil over, by tomorrow morning I believe it will boil over, that outrage, perhaps he will realize that he has got to rescind his order.

□ 1300

Now, here is one of those examples.

When we were all promised under ObamaCare that we would have conscience protection, a right of conscience that ObamaCare wouldn't compel us to fund abortions and sterilizations and abortifacients, of course, we found out that it did. After 2 weeks of the religious community's being critical of the President, the President finally stepped up to the podium at noon on a Friday—another finely calculated time of the week—and he said there have been some complaints from the religious communities. I am going to make an accommodation to them. Now I am going to require the insurance companies to provide these services for free.

That is the President also legislating by press conference. It is not the United States Congress. I stand in the middle of the United States Congress right now, and I am hearing some of my colleagues say we don't have the tools to restrain this President. Well, after a resolution of disapproval, after a resolution of censure, the next tool then is to cut off the funding to implement or to enforce his unconstitutional executive amnesty edict. We can do that in this Congress. We will be forced to do so in this Congress if the President doesn't restrain himself. That is how we must restrain him.

I don't want to go down that path, but if we do, let's appropriate the funds into the departments that are not relevant to this subject matter and send those appropriations bills down the hallway—to the Senate—and get them

to the President's desk one at a time if we can. Let him pick and choose. They can all sit there on his desk, all but Justice and the Department of Homeland Security. Those two pieces of legislation will be necessary for us to pass by exempting from funding those components of the President's edict.

Some have said that we could always claw that money back in a rescissions bill. The simple answer to that is, no, we would not be able to do that because, even if we got a rescissions bill to the President's desk, he would veto it. Some have said that we can't cut the funding off to implement what we anticipate to be the President's act because it is fee-based under USCIS, the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services. So that is fees, fee for service, and that would be authorizing on an appropriations bill. I would remind people that this Congress has multiple times done just that.

They used the rule when I wanted to cut off the funding to ObamaCare, and I brought it before the Rules Committee—anybody can look it up—on February 14, 2011. I was advised that I shouldn't have put them in that position. They were going to have to say “no” to me even though they agreed with me on the policy because we couldn't effect policy in an appropriations bill. Of course, the answer is, yes, we can. We can do anything we choose to do. I would start with this.

In the Constitution, it says:

Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings.

We set the rules here. In the Rules resolution, we waive continually the provisions. Here is one:

All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived . . . All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived . . . The previous question shall be considered ordered and the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion.

That is an example of a rule. The rule, itself, waives points of order here on the floor. We can write what we choose to write into legislation that would cut off the funding to implement or enforce a lawless and unconstitutional act. To those who say we can't do so with fees, I will read you the language that does so:

None of the funds made available in this Act or any user fees and other revenue may be used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the documents described—and we describe the documents.

This is not rocket science.

Are we going to allow a President to violate the Constitution and say our rules in the House won't let us restrain the President?

I call that another red herring, red herring number two. There will likely be another one or two.

This Congress, Mr. Speaker, must do its constitutional duty. It must adhere to our oath to the Constitution. We will be called to do that at 8 o'clock tonight. I will be prepared and so will millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities towards the President.

Does the gentleman from Iowa seek recognition to offer a motion to adjourn?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Is the adjournment resolution more broad than this? The reason I am asking is because, if we have an emergency, are we able to return at the call of the Chair?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct that the House adopted an adjournment resolution earlier today. The Chair understands that the gentleman's motion will invoke a separate order.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FORTENBERRY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY of California) for today on account of a family illness.

Mr. NADLER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending a funeral.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 1, 2014, at 2 p.m., unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 119, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7817. A letter from the FSA Regulatory Review Group Director, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Farm Loan Programs; Entity Eligibility (RIN: 0560-A125) received October 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7818. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pine Shoot Beetle; Addition of Quarantined Areas and Regulated Articles [Docket No.: APHIS-2010-0031] received October 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7819. A letter from the Acting Director, Legislative Affairs Division, Department of